

$D^* \rightarrow D\gamma$ and $B^* \rightarrow B\gamma$ as derived from QCD Sum Rules

Shi-lin Zhu,¹ W-Y. P. Hwang,^{2,3} and Ze-sen Yang¹

¹Department of Physics, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China

²Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan 10764

³Center for Theoretical Physics, Laboratory for Nuclear Science and

Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,

Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

February 1, 2008

Abstract

The method of QCD sum rules in the presence of the external electromagnetic $F_{\mu\nu}$ field is used to analyze radiative decays of charmed or bottomed mesons such as $D^* \rightarrow D\gamma$ and $B^* \rightarrow B\gamma$, with the susceptibilities obtained previously from the study of baryon magnetic moments. Our predictions on D^* decays agree very well with the experimental data. There are differences among the various theoretical predictions on B^* decays but the data are not yet available.

PACS Indices: 14.40.Jz; 13.20.Fc; 13.20.Jf

Heavy flavor physics provides a natural and convenient laboratory for testing basic ideas such as the CKM matrix, heavy quark symmetry, and aspects related to quantum chromodynamics (QCD). Indeed, it is often believed that the nonperturbative aspects of QCD may play a less significant role in the heavy quark sector as compared to that in the light quark systems, thereby offering simplifications in testing fundamental ideas.

The situation regarding radiative decays of charmed and bottomed mesons such as $D^* \rightarrow D\gamma$ and $B^* \rightarrow B\gamma$ is a little confusing at the moment. In the charmed sector, the predictions [1,2] based on heavy quark symmetry differ from those [3] obtained by implementing simultaneously both heavy quark symmetry and chiral symmetry. And, yet, these predictions also differ significantly from those [4] obtained in a relativistic constituent quark model. The disparity among these predictions makes it very difficult, if not impossible, to assess the significance of the underlying idea(s) under investigation.

As a potentially useful benchmark, we wish to present and discuss the predictions which may be obtained by employing the method of QCD sum rules [5], especially using such method in the presence of an external electromagnetic field [6, 7]. The important aspect here is that the various susceptibilities involved in such method have already been determined from previous studies of baryon magnetic moments and as a result our predictions are parameter-free on top of the straightforward nature of applying the method to the heavy quark sector.

We recall [6, 7] that the two-point correlation function $\Pi(p)$ in the presence of the constant electromagnetic field $F_{\mu\nu}$ may be used as the basis for the derivation of QCD sum rules. Using the radiative decay $B^{*0} \rightarrow B^0\gamma$ as a specific example, we have

$$\Pi_\mu(p) = i \int d^4x e^{ipx} \langle 0 | T[j_\mu^{B^{*0}}(x), j^{B^0}(0)] | 0 \rangle_{F_{\alpha\beta}}, \quad (1)$$

where the interpolating fields are

$$j_\mu^{B^{*0}}(x) = \bar{b}^a(x) \gamma_\mu d^a(x), \quad j^{B^0}(x) = \bar{b}^a(x) i \gamma_5 d^a(x), \quad (2)$$

with a the color index. The decay constants f_{B^*} and f_B are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 0|j_\mu^{B^*}(0)|B^*(p)\rangle &= f_{B^*} m_{B^*} \epsilon_\mu, \\ \langle 0|j^B(0)|B(p)\rangle &= f_B \frac{m_B^2}{m_b+m_d},\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

where ϵ_μ is the polarization 4-vector of the B^* meson.

The decay process $B^*(1^-) \rightarrow B(0^-) + \gamma$ may be characterized uniquely as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{B^*B\gamma} = e \frac{g_{B^*B\gamma}}{m_{B^*}} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\delta} \partial^\nu A^\mu B^{*\lambda} \partial^\delta B,\tag{4}$$

where A_μ is the electromagnetic field. The corresponding partial width is

$$\Gamma(B^* \rightarrow B\gamma) = \alpha \frac{g_{B^* \rightarrow B\gamma}^2}{3} \frac{P_{\text{cm}}^3}{m_{B^*}^2},\tag{5}$$

with P_{cm} the B meson momentum in the CM frame (i.e. in the rest frame of the initial vector meson B^*).

The external field $F_{\mu\nu}$ may induce changes in the physical vacuum and modify the propagation of quarks. Up to dimension six ($d \leq 6$), we may introduce three induced condensates as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 0|\bar{q}\sigma_{\mu\nu}q|0\rangle_{F_{\mu\nu}} &= e_q e \chi F_{\mu\nu} \langle 0|\bar{q}q|0\rangle, \\ g_c \langle 0|\bar{q}\frac{\lambda^n}{2}G_{\mu\nu}^n q|0\rangle_{F_{\mu\nu}} &= e_q e \kappa F_{\mu\nu} \langle 0|\bar{q}q|0\rangle, \\ g_c \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} \langle 0|\bar{q}\gamma_5 \frac{\lambda^n}{2}G_{\lambda\sigma}^n q|0\rangle_{F_{\mu\nu}} &= i e_q e \xi F^{\mu\nu} \langle 0|\bar{q}q|0\rangle,\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

where q refers mainly to u or d with suitable modifications for the s quark (while the condensates involving the charm or bottom quark are assumed to be negligible), e is the unit charge, $e_u = \frac{2}{3}$, and $e_d = -\frac{1}{3}$. In studying baryon magnetic moments, Ioffe and Smilga [6] obtained the nucleon anomalous magnetic moments $\mu_p = 3.0$ and $\mu_n = -2.0$ ($\pm 10\%$) with the quark condensate susceptibilities $\chi \approx -8 \text{ GeV}^2$ and κ, ξ quite small. Balitsky and Yung [7] adopted the one-pole approximation to estimate the susceptibilities and obtained,

$$\chi = -3.3 \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \quad \kappa = 0.22, \quad \xi = -0.44.\tag{7}$$

Subsequently Belyaev and Kogan [8] extended the calculation and obtained an improved estimate $\chi = -5.7 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ using the two-pole approximation. Chiu et al [10] also estimated the susceptibilities with two-pole model and obtained

$$\chi = -4.4 \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \quad \kappa = 0.4, \quad \xi = -0.8. \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, Chiu and co-workers [10] re-analysed the various sum rules by treating χ , κ , and ξ as free parameters to provide an overall fit to the observed baryon magnetic moments. The optimal values which they obtained are given by

$$\chi = -3 \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \quad \kappa = 0.75, \quad \xi = -1.5. \quad (9)$$

We note that in these analyses the susceptibility values are consistent with one another except for the earliest result $\chi = -8 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ in [6], which is considerably larger (in magnitude). In what follows, we shall adopt the condensate parameters $\chi = -3.5 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$, $2\kappa + \xi \approx 0$ with κ , ξ quite small, which represent the average of the latter values discussed above. The same set of susceptibilities yields a very good overall agreement [9] with the experiment for the vector meson decays in $SU_f(3)$ sector (u , d , s).

At the quark level, the correlation function $\Pi_\mu(p)$ may be evaluated with the aid of the formula:

$$\Pi_\mu(p) = -i \int d^4x e^{ipx} \text{Tr} [iS_b^{ef}(-x) \gamma_\mu iS_d^{fe}(x) i\gamma_5] \quad (10)$$

where $iS^{ab}(x)$ is the quark propagator in the presence of the external electromagnetic field $F_{\mu\nu}$ [6]. To incorporate the (heavy) quark mass, we choose to work in momentum space.

For example, we have, for the down quark propagator,

$$\begin{aligned}
iS_d^{ab}(p) = & \delta^{ab} \frac{i}{\hat{p} - m_d} \\
& + \frac{i}{4} \frac{\lambda_{ab}^n}{2} g_c G_{\mu\nu}^n \frac{1}{(p^2 - m_d^2)^2} [\sigma^{\mu\nu} (\hat{p} + m_d) + (\hat{p} + m_d) \sigma^{\mu\nu}] \\
& + \frac{i}{4} e_d \delta^{ab} F_{\mu\nu} \frac{1}{(p^2 - m_d^2)^2} [\sigma^{\mu\nu} (\hat{p} + m_d) + (\hat{p} + m_d) \sigma^{\mu\nu}] \\
& - \delta^{ab} \frac{\langle \bar{d}d \rangle}{12} (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(p) \\
& - \delta^{ab} \frac{\langle g_c \bar{d}\sigma \cdot Gd \rangle}{192} (2\pi)^4 g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \delta^4(p) \\
& - \delta^{ab} e_d \frac{\langle \bar{d}d \rangle}{192} [\sigma \cdot F g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3} \gamma^\mu \sigma \cdot F \gamma^\nu] (2\pi)^4 \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \delta^4(p) \\
& - \delta^{ab} e_d \chi \frac{\langle \bar{d}d \rangle}{24} \sigma \cdot F (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(p) \\
& - \delta^{ab} e_d \kappa \frac{\langle \bar{d}d \rangle}{192} [\sigma \cdot F g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3} \gamma^\mu \sigma \cdot F \gamma^\nu] (2\pi)^4 \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \delta^4(p) \\
& + i \delta^{ab} e_d \xi \frac{\langle \bar{d}d \rangle}{2^8 \times 3} [\sigma^{\delta\rho} g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3} \gamma^\mu \sigma^{\delta\rho} \gamma^\nu] \gamma_5 \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\delta\rho} F^{\alpha\beta} (2\pi)^4 \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \delta^4(p) \\
& + \dots,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

with $\hat{p} \equiv p_\mu \gamma^\mu$. Here we follow [6, 7] and do not introduce induced condensates of higher dimensions.

Substituting the quark propagator back into $\Pi_\mu(p)$ (and neglecting condensates related to the heavy quark), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_\mu^{l.h.s.}(p) = & \left\{ \frac{3}{8\pi^2} m_b \int_0^1 dx \frac{e_b(1-x) + e_d x}{m_b^2 - p^2 x} - \frac{e_d}{2} \chi \langle 0 | \bar{d}d | 0 \rangle \frac{1}{p^2 - m_b^2} \right. \\
& + \frac{e_d - e_b - \xi}{2} \langle 0 | \bar{d}d | 0 \rangle \frac{1}{(p^2 - m_b^2)^2} + \frac{e_d}{3} (\xi - \kappa - 1) \langle 0 | \bar{d}d | 0 \rangle \frac{p^2}{(p^2 - m_b^2)^3} \\
& + \frac{e_b}{24} \langle 0 | g_c \bar{d}\sigma \cdot Gd | 0 \rangle \frac{1}{(p^2 - m_b^2)^3} - \left(\frac{3}{8} e_b + \frac{e_d}{4} \right) \langle 0 | g_c \bar{d}\sigma \cdot Gd | 0 \rangle \frac{m^2}{(p^2 - m_b^2)^4} \\
& \left. + \dots \right\} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\sigma} F^{\alpha\beta} p^\sigma
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Note that the operators with lowest dimension ($d = 1$) arise from the heavy quark mass m_h and the induced light quark condensate $\chi \langle 0 | \bar{q}q | 0 \rangle$, which are respectively the first two terms in Eq. (12). The next two terms represent dimension-three contributions arising from the three condensates $\langle 0 | \bar{q}q | 0 \rangle$, $\kappa \langle 0 | \bar{q}q | 0 \rangle$, and $\xi \langle 0 | \bar{q}q | 0 \rangle$. At dimension five, we have kept only the quark-gluon mixed condensate [the remaining two terms in (12)] as the contributions from gluon condensates are found to be negligible.

The short-distance operator-product expansion (12) converges rapidly. For bottomed mesons, the perturbative term contributes up to as much as 90% of the total sum rules

(at $p^2 = 0$), while the induced quark condensate dominates the power corrections and its contribution is about 9%. The contributions from the condensates of higher dimensions cancel among themselves and the net results are very small. For charmed mesons, the perturbative contribution is about 70% as due to the comparatively smaller charm quark mass. Again the contribution from the induced quark condensate is dominant among the remaining power corrections. We wish to point out that, unlike in the QCD sum rules analyses of charmonium where the perturbative contribution and the gluon condensate play a very important role, in the present analysis the contributions from the light quark condensates $\chi\langle 0|\bar{q}q|0\rangle$ and $\langle 0|\bar{q}q|0\rangle$ are in fact much more important than that from the gluon condensate.

At the hadronic level, we express $\Pi(p)$ as follows:

$$\Pi_{\mu}^{r.h.s.}(p) = f_{B^*}f_B \frac{m_B^2}{m_b + m_d} \frac{g_{B^*B\gamma}}{2} \frac{1}{p^2 - m_{B^*}^2} \frac{1}{p^2 - m_B^2} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\sigma} F^{\alpha\beta} p^{\sigma} + \dots, \quad (13)$$

where we write down explicitly the leading $B^* \rightarrow B\gamma$ contribution and denote the contribution from the excited states and continuum simply by the ellipsis.

Unlike for light quark systems, Borel transform is no longer the most efficient way to accentuate the contribution from the ground state. The reason is twofold: First of all, we note that in performing Borel transform the single-pole contributions from excited states give rise to an additional term AM_B^2 on the phenomenological side of the sum rule [6, 14]. Due to the small energy gap between the ground state and excited states in heavy meson systems, this term could be fairly large. On the other hand, it was suggested [5, 11] that a method of taking suitable moments (as used below) could be more efficient to suppress the contributions from the excited states, as the heavy quark mass provides a natural scale ($m_h \gg \Lambda_{QCD}$).

To simplify the numerical manipulation we adopt the following approximation:

$$\frac{1}{p^2 - m_{B^*}^2} \frac{1}{p^2 - m_B^2} \approx \frac{1}{(p^2 - \bar{m}_B^2)^2}, \quad (14)$$

where $\bar{m}_B^2 = \frac{m_{B^*}^2 + m_B^2}{2}$. The approximation is justified to the level of one part in 10^4 (since

$m_{B^*} - m_B = 46 \text{ MeV}$ and we are very far away from either of the two poles).

In order to pick out the ground state contribution we define moments by taking derivatives of the correlator $\Pi(p)$ (the coefficient of $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\sigma} F^{\alpha\beta} p^\sigma$ in $\Pi_\mu(p)$) [5, 11],

$$M_n \equiv \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \left(\frac{d}{dp^2} \right)^n \Pi(p) |_{p^2 = -Q_0^2}, \quad (Q_0^2 \geq 0). \quad (15)$$

At the phenomenological side (r.h.s.) we have

$$M_n^{r.h.s.}(Q_0^2) = f_{B^*} f_B \frac{m_B^2}{m_b + m_d} \frac{g_{B^* B \gamma}}{2} \frac{1}{(\overline{m}_B^2 + Q_0^2)^{n+2}} [1 + \delta_n(Q_0^2)] \quad (16)$$

where $\delta_n(Q_0^2)$ contains the contributions from the higher resonances and the continuum. For high n , $\delta_n(Q_0^2)$ goes to zero rapidly because of the factors $(\frac{\overline{m}_B^2 + Q_0^2}{\overline{m}_{B'}^2 + Q_0^2})^{n+2}$ it contains and because $\overline{m}_{B'} > \overline{m}_B$. So from a certain n onwards $M_n^{r.h.s.}(Q_0^2)$ will be practically equal to the contribution of the ground state. We also introduce the ratios of the moments:

$$r_n(Q_0^2) \equiv \frac{M_{n-1}(Q_0^2)}{M_n(Q_0^2)} = (\overline{m}_B^2 + Q_0^2) \frac{1 + \delta_{n-1}(Q_0^2)}{1 + \delta_n(Q_0^2)}, \quad (17)$$

which immediately yields the mass $\overline{m}_B^2$ if we are at sufficiently high n where $\delta_n(Q_0^2) \approx \delta_{n-1}(Q_0^2)$ [11]. We use the ratios to check the convergency and consistency of our sum rule. As observed in [5, 11] the stability region in n will change with the parameter $y = \frac{Q_0^2}{m_b^2}$ and one should study the stability of the moments for growing y . A plateau develops for certain n and y if the sum rules work well, which arises from the balance of the perturbative contributions and power corrections. We have checked that, in the region $y = 0.3 \sim 0.7$ and $n = 11 \sim 16$, the mass $\overline{m}_B = \sqrt{\frac{m_{B'}^2 + m_B^2}{2}}$ extracted in this way agrees very well with the experimental value. The heavy quark mass is scale dependent. We take $m_b = 4.7 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_c = 1.3 \text{ GeV}$ as commonly adopted in the QCD sum rule approach [5, 14]. We take the values from the standard two-point sum rules for the decay constants f_B and f_{B^*} [14]

$$f_B = 140 \text{ MeV}, \quad f_{B^*} = 160 \text{ MeV}. \quad (18)$$

Using the experimental heavy meson masses $m_B = 5.28 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_{B^*} = 5.33 \text{ GeV}$ [12]

and equating

$$M_n^{l.h.s.}(Q_0^2) = M_n^{r.h.s.}(Q_0^2) \quad (19)$$

with y, n in the region $y = 0.3 \sim 0.7$, $n = 11 \sim 16$ where the plateau develops, we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g_{B^{*0}B^0\gamma} &= -4.0 \pm 0.4, \\ g_{B^{*+}B^+\gamma} &= 6.8 \pm 0.6, \\ g_{B_s^*B_s\gamma} &= -5.0 \pm 0.5. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

We have included the correction due to the strange quark mass $m_s = 150 \text{ MeV}$ which reproduces roughly the $B_s^* - B^*$ mass splitting. Note that the indicated errors are due to the method of QCD sum rules itself. Typically in the region $y = 0.3 \sim 0.7$ and $n = 11 \sim 16$ the perturbative term, the induced quark condensate, the dimension-three correction, and the dimension-five correction contribute 56%, 57%, -18%, and 5% of the sum rule, respectively. Using the above couplings, we obtain the partial width as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{B^{*0} \rightarrow B^0 \gamma} &= 0.13 \pm 0.03 \text{ keV}, \\ \Gamma_{B^{*+} \rightarrow B^+ \gamma} &= 0.38 \pm 0.06 \text{ keV}, \\ \Gamma_{B_s^* \rightarrow B_s \gamma} &= 0.22 \pm 0.04 \text{ keV}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

which are also listed in Table I. The experiments to measure these partial widths are yet to be carried out.

The above derivation holds for charmed mesons, except that the charm quark is not so heavy as the bottom quark so that the plateau develops at larger y ($y = 1.5 \sim 2.0$, $n = 5 \sim 8$). Using the sum rule values $f_D = 170 \pm 10 \text{ MeV}$ and $f_{D^*} = 240 \pm 20 \text{ MeV}$ and the observed masses $m_D = 1.87 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_{D^*} = 2.01 \text{ GeV}$, we obtain the couplings:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{D^{*0}D^0\gamma} &= 2.88 \pm 0.3, \\ g_{D^{*+}D^+\gamma} &= -0.38 \pm 0.1, \\ g_{D_s^*D_s\gamma} &= -0.3 \pm 0.1. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The sum rule for $g_{D^{*0}D^0\gamma}$ is stable. However, the sum rule for $g_{D^{*+}D^+\gamma}$ suffers from the fact that the perturbative contributions from the charm and up quarks tend to cancel

each other. To extract $g_{D^{*+}D^+\gamma}$ reliably, we combine the sum rules for $g_{D^{*+}D^+\gamma}$ and $g_{D^{*0}D^0\gamma}$ to get a new stable sum rules for the quantity $(g_{D^{*+}D^+\gamma} + g_{D^{*0}D^0\gamma})$. Nevertheless, the error is larger for $g_{D^{*+}D^+\gamma}$. The partial widths as calculated from the above couplings are given below.

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \gamma} &= 12.9 \pm 2 \text{keV}, \\ \Gamma_{D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+ \gamma} &= 0.23 \pm 0.1 \text{keV}, \\ \Gamma_{D_s^* \rightarrow D_s \gamma} &= 0.13 \pm 0.05 \text{keV},\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

which are also listed in Table I.

Note that there are data from the CLEO collaboration [15]:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Gamma_{D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \gamma}}{\Gamma_{D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^0}} &= 0.572 \pm 0.057 \pm 0.081, \\ \frac{\Gamma_{\gamma}^+}{\Gamma_{\gamma}^0} = \frac{\Gamma_{D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+ \gamma}}{\Gamma_{D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \gamma}} &= 0.04 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.06, \\ B(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+ \gamma) &= 0.011 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.016.\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

Our results yield

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\gamma}^+}{\Gamma_{\gamma}^0} \approx 0.018,\tag{25}$$

which is consistent with the CLEO data. On the other hand, the partial width for $D^* \rightarrow D + \pi$ has also been obtained making use of the light-cone QCD sum rules [14].

$$\Gamma(D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^0) = (23 \pm 3) \text{keV},\tag{26}$$

$$\Gamma(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+) + \Gamma(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+ \pi^0) = (46 \pm 7) \text{keV}.\tag{27}$$

Combining our predictions with these results, we obtain

$$\frac{\Gamma_{D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \gamma}}{\Gamma_{D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^0}} = 0.56,\tag{28}$$

$$B(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+ \gamma) = 0.005,\tag{29}$$

both of which are in agreement with the CLEO data cited above.

TABLE I. Comparison between some theoretical calculations based on heavy quark and chiral symmetry [1, 3], the relativistic quark model [4], and QCD sum rules approach (this work). The unit is keV.

	Cho ^a [1]	Cho ^b [1]	Cheng [3]	Jaus [4]	this work
$D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \gamma$	11.3 ± 22.0	8.8 ± 17.1	34	21.69	12.9 ± 2
$D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+ \gamma$	10.6 ± 10.5	8.3 ± 8.1	2	0.56	0.23 ± 0.1
$D_s^{*} \rightarrow D_s \gamma$	-	-	0.3	-	0.13 ± 0.05
$B^{*0} \rightarrow B^0 \gamma$	0.163 ± 0.261	0.127 ± 0.203	0.28	0.142	0.13 ± 0.03
$B^{*+} \rightarrow B^+ \gamma$	0.846 ± 1.494	0.66 ± 0.931	0.84	0.429	0.38 ± 0.06
$B_s^{*} \rightarrow B_s \gamma$	-	-	-	-	0.22 ± 0.04

^a with the parameters $m_c = 1500$ MeV, $m_b = 4500$ MeV.

^b with the parameters $m_c = 1700$ MeV, $m_b = 5000$ MeV.

To sum up, we collect in Table I the existing theoretical predictions on the radiative decay widths for the bottomed and charmed mesons. As indicated earlier, our predictions in the charm sector are in good overall agreement with the existing CLEO data. In the bottom sector, there are differences (albeit less significant) among the various theoretical predictions but the data are not yet available.

This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China and by Doctoral Program Foundation of the State Commission. It is also supported in part by the National Science Council of R.O.C. (Taiwan) under the grant NSC86-2112-M002-010Y.

References

- [1] P. Cho and H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **296**, 408 (1992); B **300**, 410(E) (1993).

- [2] J. F. Amundson, C. G. Boyd, E. Jenkins, M. Luke, A. V. Manohar, J. L. Rosner, M. J. Savage, and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **296**, 415 (1992).
- [3] H. Y. Cheng, C. Y. Cheung, G. L. Lin, Y. C. Lin, T. M. Yan, and H. L. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 1030 (1993) and references therein.
- [4] W. Jaus, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 1349 (1996).
- [5] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vaishtein, and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **147**, 385, 448 (1979).
- [6] B. L. Ioffe and A. V. Smilga, Nucl. Phys. B **232**, 109 (1984).
- [7] I. I. Balitsky and A. V. Yung, Phys. Lett. B **129**, 328 (1983).
- [8] V. M. Belyaev and Ya. I. Kogan, Yad. Fiz **40**, 1035 (1984) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **40**, 659 (1984)].
- [9] S.-L. Zhu, W.-Y. P. Hwang, and Z.-S. Yang, Phys. Rev. D, submitted for publication.
- [10] C. B. Chiu, J. Pasupathy, and S. J. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D **33**, 1961 (1986); C. B. Chiu, S. L. Wilson, J. Pasupathy, and J. P. Singh, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 1533 (1987).
- [11] L. J. Reinders, H. Rubinstein, and S. Yazaki, Phys. Rep. **127**, 1 (1985).
- [12] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 1173 (1994).
- [13] S. C. Generalis and D. J. Broadhurst, Phys. Lett. B **139**, 85 (1984).
- [14] V. M. Belyaev, V. M. Braun, A. Khodjamirian, and R. Rückl, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 6177 (1995).
- [15] CLEO Collaboration, F. Butler et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2041 (1992).